



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,863	07/22/2003	Bruce A. Phillips	020366-091300US	7985

20350 7590 12/07/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
SCHEIBEL, ROBERT C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2619	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,863

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

Robert C. Scheibel

Art Unit

2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- Examiner acknowledges receipt of Applicant's amendment filed 9/26/2007.
- Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, and 18 are currently amended.
- New claims 23-25 have been added.
- Claims 13, 16, and 22 have been cancelled.
- Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 17-21, and 23-25 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

1. The objection to claim 17 regarding the phrase "an incoming phone call" has been overcome and that specific objection has been withdrawn. However, new objections have been introduced based on the amended claim language. Further, Applicant has omitted original line 3 without appropriate editing notations indication this amendment:

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-10, filed 9/26/2007, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-4, 8, and 10-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. However, as the Forte reference was applied in the new rejection, Examiner makes the following comments regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to Forte.

In the first 2 paragraphs of the section on Forte on page 8, Applicant summarizes the reference and portions of the MPEP. In the next 2 paragraphs of this section, Applicant argues that Forte doesn't disclose the system using a switch, only a wireless connect unit (WC). However, as indicated below, Forte clearly indicates that the WC can be implemented as part of the PBX which is a telephone switch (see lines 36-47 of column 12). Further, in the next paragraph, Applicant argues that Forte does not disclose expressly other limitations of the

claims. These limitations are obvious modifications in view of Levine as explained in detail below.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the incoming phone call" should be changed to "an incoming phone call". Alternatively, the original line 3 of claim 17 (which was removed from the claims without text markings indicating this change) could be added back to the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,816,582 to Levine et al.

Regarding claim 1, Levine discloses a telephonic communication system for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service (the system of figure 2, for example), the telephonic communication system comprising:

a first communication channel to a wireless phone (the channel connecting the SSP/MSC to the wireless phone 234 in figure 2), wherein incoming phone calls are directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (the cellular telephone discussed in lines 41-45 of column 2, for example);

a second communication channel to an interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the channels between telephones 230 and 232 in figure 2, for example);

a telephone switch (the SSP/MSC 206 of Figure 2) coupled to the first and second communication channels, wherein the telephone switch receives an incoming phone call on the first communication channel directed to the telephone number for the wireless phone (see the passage in lines 5-7 of column 6 which indicates that the SSP/MSC is receiving a call for the wireless (cellular) telephone), the telephone switch determines if the second communication channel should be simultaneously sent the incoming phone call directed to the telephone number (see lines 5-17 of column 6; the SSP/MSC determines (by sending and receiving messages to/from the SCP) whether one or more alternative numbers (such as to wired phones 230 and 232) are to be simultaneously called).

Regarding claim 10, Levine discloses a method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing an incoming phone call to a wireless phone, the incoming phone call is directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (see lines 5-17 of column 6 as well as lines 19-38 of column 5; the call in the example in column 6 is routed to the wireless phone);

receiving the incoming phone call at a demarcation device having a wireless interface, the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (see lines 5-17 of column 6; the demarcation device is the SSP/MSC);

determining if the incoming phone call should be routed to the one or more wired phones (see lines 5-17 of column 6; the SSP/MSC determines (by sending and receiving messages to/from the SCP) whether one or more alternative numbers (such as to wired phones 230 and 232) are to be simultaneously called); and

routing the incoming phone call to one or more of the wired phones (see lines 13-17 of column 6).

Similarly, regarding claim 17, Levine discloses a method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing the incoming phone call to a wireless phone, the incoming phone call is directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (see lines 5-17 of column 6 as well as lines 19-38 of column 5; the call in the example in column 6 is routed to the wireless phone);

routing the incoming phone call to a demarcation device having a wireless interface, the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location ((see lines 5-17 of column 6; the demarcation device is the SSP/MSC)), wherein:

the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (the routing of the call to the wireless phone and the SSP/MSC occur at nearly essentially same time);

determining if the wireless phone should be sent the incoming phone call (see lines 5-17 of column 6 which describes how the SSP/MSC determines to send the call to the wireless (cellular) phone); and

determining if the one or more wired phones should be sent the incoming phone call (see lines 5-17 of column 6 which describes how the SSP/MSC determines (with the help of the SCP) whether the wired phone(s) are to be sent the call).

Regarding claim 3, Levine discloses the limitation that the interface is located at the user location in Figure 2 which shows the interface to the phones 230 and 232 which is a user location.

Regarding claim 4, Levine discloses the limitation that the telephone switch provisionally sends the incoming phone call to the second communication channel until acceptance of the incoming phone call when one of the first and second communication channels receives the incoming phone call and the other of the first and second communication channel is disconnected from the incoming phone call (see lines 19-21 in column 6).

Regarding claim 8, Levine discloses the limitation that the first communication channel uses different physical transport from the second communication channel (see figure 2 – the physical interface to the wireless phone 234 is clearly different than the interface to the wired phones 230 and 232).

Regarding claim 11, Levine discloses the limitation that the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (the service is referred to as simultaneous ringing throughout).

Regarding claim 12, Levine discloses the limitations that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (lines 19-21 of column 6); if the one or more wired phones has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (lines 19-21 of column 6); if the one or more wired phones has not answered, detecting if the wireless phone has answered (lines 19-21 of column 6); if the wireless phone has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (lines 19-21 of column 6); and if the one or more wired phones has not answered and if the wireless phone has not answered, sending the incoming phone call to a voice mail system (lines 30-43 of column 8).

Regarding claim 14, Levine discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones and the wireless phone use a unified voice mailbox (see lines 30-43 of column 8).

Regarding claim 15, Levine discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 10 in that all the limitations of the method are disclosed as above and the passage from lines 13-15 of column 2 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software.

Regarding claim 19, Forte discloses the limitation that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (lines 19-21 of column 6).

Regarding claim 20, Forte discloses the limitation that the second-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the wireless phone has been answered (lines 19-21 of column 6).

Regarding claim 21, Forte discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 17 in that all the limitations of the method are disclosed as above and the passage from lines 13-15 of column 2 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software.

Regarding claim 23, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones have been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (lines 19-21 of column 6).

Regarding claim 24, Levine discloses the limitation that if the wireless phone has answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (lines 19-21 of column 6).

Regarding claim 25, Levine discloses the limitation that if neither the one or more wired phones or the wireless phone has been answered, sending the incoming phone call to a unified voice mail system (lines 30-43 of column 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims **1-4, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-21, and 23-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,162,020 to Forte in view of U.S. Patent 6,816,582 to Levine et al.

Regarding claim **1**, Forte discloses a telephonic communication system for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the telephonic communication system comprising:

a first communication channel to a wireless phone (the link from the Wireless Connect 30 to the cellular phone 70 of Figures 1 and 3), wherein incoming phone calls are directed to the wireless phone with a telephone number (the cellular telephone 70 of figure 1, for example);

a second communication channel to an interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the link from the Wireless Connect 30 to telephones 12a and 12b of Figures 1 and 3, for example);

a telephone switch (the combination of the PBX 14 and Wireless Connect 30 of Figures 1 and 3; as indicated in lines 37-47 of column 12, these can be combined into one device) coupled to the first and second communication channels, wherein the telephone switch receives an incoming phone call on a communication channel, the telephone switch determines if the other communication channel should be simultaneously sent the incoming phone call directed to the telephone number (see lines 46-49 of column 13).

Similarly, regarding claim **10**, Forte discloses a method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing an incoming phone call to a phone, the incoming phone call is directed to the phone with a telephone number (see lines 56-63 of column 6 which indicate the call directed to the wired device (12a) is directed to at least that phone);

receiving the incoming phone call at a demarcation device having a wireless interface, the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the WC/PBX is the demarcation device and the incoming call is received there as described in lines 56-63 of column 6, for example);

determining if the incoming phone call should be routed to the one or more other phones (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example); and

routing the incoming phone call to one or more of the other phones (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example).

Similarly, regarding claim 17, Forte discloses a method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service, the method comprising steps of:

routing the incoming phone call to a phone, the incoming phone call is directed to the phone with a telephone number (see lines 56-63 of column 6 which indicate the call directed to the wired device (12a) is directed to at least that phone);

routing the incoming phone call to a demarcation device having a wireless interface, the demarcation device coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location (the WC/PBX is the demarcation device and the incoming call is received there as described in lines 56-63 of column 6, for example), wherein:

the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (see lines 46-49 of column 13, for example);

determining if the phone should be sent the incoming phone call (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example); and

determining if the one or more other phones should be sent the incoming phone call (this is described throughout the document; consider the passage from line 67 of column 2 through line 3 of column 3 and lines 56-63 of column 6, for example).

Forte does not disclose expressly the limitations that the incoming call is directed towards a wireless phone and that the call is routed to one or more wired phones in addition to the targeted wireless phone. However, Levine discloses the limitation of an incoming call routed to a wireless phone number and then simultaneously ringing alternative wired devices throughout the document. See lines 3-5 of column 2 and lines 41-45 of column 2, for example. Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to allow a wireless telephone to be the target of the incoming call. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user more flexibility by allowing the user's wireless (cellular) telephone to be the main number. This is suggested by Levine in lines 48-65 of column 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of improved user flexibility to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 10, and 17.

Regarding claim 2, Forte discloses the limitation that the wireless phone and the wireless interface uses one of GSM, CDMA, AMPS, and TDMA transport (see lines 22-25 of column 5).

Regarding claim 3, Forte discloses the limitation that the interface is located at the user location in that the WC and PBX are preferably co-located (see lines 51-55 of column 11) and the PBX is clearly at the user location (where phones 12a and 12b are located).

Regarding claim 4, Forte discloses the limitation that the telephone switch provisionally sends the incoming phone call to the second communication channel until acceptance of the incoming phone call when one of the first and second communication channels receives the incoming phone call and the other of the first and second communication channel is disconnected from the incoming phone call (see steps 414-420 of Figure 4).

Regarding claim 8, Forte discloses the limitation that the first communication channel uses different physical transport from the second communication channel (see figure 1 which clearly shows a different interface between WC and the PBX and wireless phone).

Regarding claim 9, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones are chosen from the group consisting of a POTS phone, a cordless phone, a WIFI TM SIP phone, and a wired SIP phone in that the analog telephone 12b is chosen from this group as it is a POTS phone.

Regarding claim 11, Forte discloses the limitation that the first and second-listed routing steps are performed, at least partially, simultaneously (see lines 46-49 of column 13).

Regarding claim 12, Forte discloses the limitation that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (lines 59-61 of column 6); if the one or more wired phones has answered, terminate the incoming phone call

to the wireless phone (lines 59-61 of column 6); if the one or more wired phones has not answered, detecting if the wireless phone has answered (lines 62-63 of column 6).

Forte does not disclose *expressly* the limitations that if the wireless phone has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones; and if the one or more wired phones has not answered and if the wireless phone has not answered, sending the incoming phone call to a voice mail system. However, Levine discloses the limitations that if the wireless phone has answered, terminate the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (lines 19-21 of column 6); and if the one or more wired phones has not answered and if the wireless phone has not answered, sending the incoming phone call to a voice mail system (lines 30-43 of column 8).

Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to terminate all other calls when one phone answers and to transition to voice mail after a certain delay. The motivation for doing so would have been to conserve network resources; in both cases, continuing to ring an unanswered line consumes network resources unnecessarily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of conserving network resources to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim 14, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones and the wireless phone use a unified voice mailbox (see lines 64-67 of column 2).

Regarding claim 15, Forte discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for

integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 10 in that all the limitations of the method are disclosed as above and the passage from line 66 of column 5 through line 10 of column 6 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software.

Regarding claim 18, Forte discloses the limitation that the demarcation device wirelessly couples the one or more wired phones to a phone call transport network in lines 23-31 of column 12 which indicate that the link between the PSTN and the PBX can be wireless.

Regarding claim 19, Forte discloses the limitation that the first-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the one or more wired phones have been answered (see step 418 of Figure 4).

Regarding claim 20, Forte discloses the limitation that the second-listed determining step comprises a step of detecting if the wireless phone has been answered (see step 414 of Figure 4).

Regarding claim 21, Forte discloses the limitation of a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the computer-implementable method for integrating wireless phone service with home phone service of claim 17 in that all the limitations of the method are disclosed as above and the passage from line 66 of column 5 through line 10 of column 6 clearly suggests that this can be implemented using software.

Regarding claim 23, Forte discloses the limitation that the one or more wired phones have been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the wireless phone (lines 59-61 of column 6).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Forte and Levine discloses the limitations of parent claim 20 as indicated above. However, Forte does not disclose *expressly* the limitation that if the wireless phone has been answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to

the one or more wired phones. However, Levine discloses the limitation that if the wireless phone has answered, stopping the routing of the incoming phone call to the one or more wired phones (lines 19-21 of column 6).

Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to terminate all other calls when one phone answers. The motivation for doing so would have been to conserve network resources; in both cases, continuing to ring an unanswered line consumes network resources unnecessarily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Forte for the benefit of conserving network resources to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Forte and Levine discloses the limitations of parent claim 20 as indicated above. However, Forte does not disclose *expressly* the limitation that if neither the one or more wired phones or the wireless phone has been answered, sending the incoming phone call to a unified voice mail system.

However, Levine discloses the limitation that if neither the one or more wired phones or the wireless phone has been answered, sending the incoming phone call to a unified voice mail system (lines 30-43 of column 8). Forte and Levine are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simultaneously ringing alternative phone numbers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Forte to transition to voice mail after a certain delay. The motivation for doing so would have been to conserve network resources; in both cases, continuing to ring an unanswered line consumes network resources unnecessarily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Levine with Forte for the benefit of conserving network resources to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

8. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,162,020 to Forte in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0170268 to Hokusui.

Regarding claim 5, Forte discloses all limitations of parent claim 1 as discussed above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Forte also discloses that one of the advantages of the invention is the ability to provide the features of the PBX network to the remote device (see lines 64-67 of column 2, for example.) Forte does not disclose expressly the limitations of claim 5 that the second communication channel can join the incoming phone call of the first communication channel, and the phone call can be manually transferred from the second Communication channel to the first communication channel. However, it is well known that call transfer and conferencing are features of PBX systems. For example, Hokusui discloses this in paragraph 3 on page 1. Forte and Hokusui are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication systems and similarly deal with simultaneously alerting multiple devices based on a single telephone number. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to *explicitly* include call transfer and conferencing in the features provided in the PBX of Forte and thus extended to the remote device to disclose the limitations of claim 5. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow flexibility generally provided in PBX systems to extend to the remote device as suggested by Forte in lines 61-67 of column 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hokusui

with Forte for the benefit of providing PBX features to the remote device to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Forte discloses all limitations of parent claim 1 as discussed above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Forte does not disclose expressly the limitation of claim 6 that the interface is one of a wireless cellular interface, a PSTN interface and a VOIP interface. However, Hokusui discloses the limitation that the interface is one of a wireless cellular interface, a PSTN interface and a VOIP interface in the LAN interface to the virtual PBX of Figure 6. Forte and Hokusui are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of communication systems and similarly deal with simultaneously alerting multiple devices based on a single telephone number. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the PBX implementation of Forte to include a LAN interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce long distance charges as suggested by Hokusui in paragraph 4 on page 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hokusui with Forte for the benefit of reducing long distance charges to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, Forte discloses the limitation that the VOIP interface is one of a wireless Internet interface, a WIFI TM interface, a power line Internet interface, an ultra-wide band wireless interface, a microwave internet interface, a cable modem interface, and a direct broadcast Satellite Internet interface in lines 23-31 of column 12 which indicate that the link between the PSTN and the PBX can be wireless. In the above combination, where the PBX is connected to a LAN using VOIP, this interface will be a wireless Internet interface which discloses the limitation that the VOIP interface is a wireless Internet interface.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Scheibel whose telephone number is 571-272-3169. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon and Thurs (6:30-5:00) and Fri (6:30-12:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/625,863
Art Unit: 2619

Page 19

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RCS 12-3-07
Robert C. Scheibel
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2619

Wing To Chan
12/5/07
WING CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER